

## IN THE CLAIMS

1. (Currently Amended) A method for generating an undeniable signature  $(y_1, \dots, y_t)$  on a set of data, the method comprising the following steps:

[[ - ]] transforming the set of data  $[[ (m) ]]$  to a sequence of a predetermined number  $[[ (t) ]]$  of blocks  $(x_1, [\dots], x_t)$ , the  $[[ (sc) ]]$  blocks being members of an Abelian group,  $[[ (this) ]]$  the transformation being a one way function  $[[ (, ) ]]$  ; and

[[ - ]] applying to each block  $[[ (x_i) ]]$  a group homomorphism  $[[ (f) ]]$  to obtain a resulting value  $[[ (y_i) ]]$ , in which a number of elements of an initial group  $[[ (G) ]]$  is larger than the number of elements  $[[ (d) ]]$  of a destination group  $[[ (H) ]]$ .

2. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the initial group  $[[ (G) ]]$  is formed by a set of invertible integers modulo  $n$ ,  $[[ (i.e.) ]]$  denoted as  $Z_n^*$ .

3. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim 2, wherein the group homomorphism  $[[ (f) ]]$  computation is based on computation of a residue character  $(\chi)$  on  $[[ (a) ]]$  the set of elements invertible integers  $Z_n^*$ .

4. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim 3, wherein the residue character  $(\chi)$  computation  $[[ (in) ]]$  is based on a parameter  $(\pi)$  serving as a key.

5. (Currently Amended) The method according to the claim 4, wherein this key parameter  $(\pi)$  is determined ~~such as~~ by:  $\pi \cdot \bar{\pi} = n$ ,  $\bar{\pi}$  being the complex conjugate of  $\pi$ .

6. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim 2, wherein the group homomorphism  $[[ (f) ]]$  computation is determined  $[[ (in) ]]$  by raising an element of  $Z_n^*$  to the power of  $r(q-1)$ , in which  $n = p \cdot q$  such that  $p = rd + 1$  and  $q$  are prime,  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ ,  $\gcd(q - 1, d) = 1$ , then by computing a discrete logarithm.

7. (Original) The method according to claim 6, wherein the group homomorphism is calculated using a factorization of  $n$ .

8. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim 1, wherein the length of the signature is dependent of the number of elements of the destination group  $[[d]]$  and the number of blocks  $[[t]]$ .

9. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim 4, wherein the parameter  $[(\pi)]$  is a secret key on an asymmetric public/secret key pair ~~public/secret~~.

10. (Currently Amended) A  $[[M]]$  method of confirming by a Verifier an undeniable signature  $(y_1, \dots, y_t)$  of a set of data  $[[m]]$  generated by a Signer taking into account a predefined security parameter  $[[k]]$  of the confirmation protocol, this Signer having a public/secret key pair, this method comprising the following steps:

$[-]$  obtaining a personal value  $(\rho)$  from the Signer, this personal value being part of the public key  $(G, H, d, \rho, (e_1, \dots, e_s))$  of the Signer $[[.]]$ ;

$[-]$  extracting a first sequence of elements  $(e_1, \dots, e_s)$  from the public key $[[.]]$ ;

$[-]$  generating a second sequence of elements  $(g_1, \dots, g_s)$  from the personal value  $(\rho)$  $[[.]]$ ;

$[-]$  generating a third sequence of elements  $(x_1, \dots, x_t)$  from the set of data  $(m)$  $[[.]]$ ;

$[-]$  randomly picking challenge parameters  $r_i \in G$  and  $a_{ij} \in Z_d$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$  and  $j = 1, \dots, s + t$  and computing a challenge value  $u_i = dr_i + a_{i1}g_1 + \dots + a_{is}g_s + a_{is+1}[[y]]x_1 + \dots + a_{is+t}[[y]]x_s[[.]]$ ;

$[-]$  sending by the Verifier the challenge value  $u_i$  to the Signer $[[.]]$ ;

$[-]$  receiving from the Signer a commitment value  $\langle v_i \rangle$ , this commitment value  $\langle v_i \rangle$  being calculated by the Signer based on a response value  $v_i = f(u_i)$  $[[.]]$ ;

$[-]$  sending by the Verifier the challenge parameters  $r_i$  and  $a_{ij}$  to the Signer $[[.]]$ ;

[[ - ]] verifying by the Signer whether  $u_i = dr_i + a_{i1}g_1 + \dots + a_{is}g_s + a_{is+1}[[y]]x_1 + \dots + a_{is+t_i}[[y]]x_{t_i}$ , and in the positive event, opening by the Signer the commitment on the response value  $(v_i)[[.]]$ ; and

[[ - ]] verifying by the Verifier whether  $v_i = a_{i1}e_1 + \dots + a_{is}e_s + a_{is+1}y_1 + \dots + a_{is+t_i}y_{t_i}$ .

11. (Currently Amended) A method for denying to a Verifier by a Signer on an alleged non-signature  $(z_1, \dots, z_t)$  of a set of data  $(m)$ , this signature being supposedly generated according to claim 1 by the Signer, this Signer having a public/secret key pair, this method taking into account a predefined security parameter  $(\ell)$  of the denial protocol and comprising the following steps:

[[ - ]] obtaining by the Verifier a personal value  $(\rho)$  of the Signer, this personal value being part of the public key  $(G, H, d, \rho, (e_1, \dots, e_s))$  of the Signer $[[.]]$ ;

[[ - ]] extracting by the Verifier a first sequence of elements  $(e_1, \dots, e_s)$  from the public key $[[.]]$ ;

[[ - ]] generating by the Verifier and the Signer a second sequence of elements  $(g_1, \dots, g_s)$  from the personal value  $(\rho)[[.]]$ ;

[[ - ]] generating by the Verifier and the Signer a third sequence of elements  $(x_1, \dots, x_t)$  from the set of data  $(m)[[.]]$ ;

[[ - ]] calculating by the Signer  $[[the]]$  a true signature  $(y_1, \dots, y_t)[[.]]$ ; and

[[ - ]] repeating the following steps  $\ell$  times,  $\ell$  being the predetermined security parameter $[[.]]$ ;

[[ - ]] randomly picking by the Verifier challenge parameters  $r_j \in G$  and  $a_{ji} \in Z_d$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$  and  $j = 1, \dots, t$  and  $\lambda \in Z_p^*$  where  $p$  is the smallest prime dividing  $d[[.]]$ ;

[[ -]] computing  $u_j := dr_j + a_{j1}g_1 + \dots a_{js}g_s + \lambda x_j$ , and  $w_j := a_{j1}e_1 + \dots a_{js}e_s + \lambda z_j$  for  $j = 1 \dots t$ [[.]];

[[ -]] sending by the Verifier the challenge values  $u_j$  and  $w_j$  to the Signer[[.]];

[[ -]] computing by the Signer a response test value  $TV_j := (z_j - y_j) \cdot \lambda$ ;

[[ -]] for each  $j = 1$  to  $t$ , determining whether the test value  $TV_j = 0$ [[.]];

[[ -]] in the negative event, calculating a test parameter  $\lambda_j$  according to the following formula :  $w_j - v_j = \lambda_j (z_j - y_j)$ ;

[[ -]] determining an intermediate value [[IV]] (IV), [[this]] the intermediate value (IV) being equal to one valid test parameter [[ $\lambda$ ]] ( $\lambda$ ) and in case of no valid test parameter is found, selecting as the intermediate value (IV) a random value[[.]];

[[ -]] sending a commitment value CT based on the intermediate value [[IV]] (IV), to the Verifier[[.]];

[[ -]] sending by the Verifier the challenge parameters  $r_j$ ,  $a_{ji}$  and test parameter [[ $\lambda$ ]] ( $\lambda$ ) to the Signer[[.]];

[[ -]] verifying by the Signer whether  $u_j = dr_j + a_{j1}g_1 + \dots a_{js}g_s + \lambda x_j$  and  $w_j := a_{j1}e_1 + \dots a_{js}e_s + \lambda z_j$  for  $j = 1 \dots t$  hold, in the positive event, the Signer opens the commitment on the intermediate value (IV) to the Verifier[[.]]; and

[[ -]] verifying by the Verifier that the test parameter [[ $\lambda$ ]] ( $\lambda$ ) is equal to the intermediate value [[IV]] (IV).

12. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 11, in which the determination of the valid test parameter comprises [[the]] a check whether  $(w_j - v_j)$  and  $(z_j - y_j)$  are not equal to 0.

13. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 11, in which  $j > 1$ , the determination of the valid test parameter comprises ~~[[the]]~~ a check whether  $(w_j - v_j)$  and  $(z_j - y_j)$  are not equal to 0, and that all of the test parameters are the same.